

Appendix A: Resident Interview Instrument

1. Spatial Patterns

a. Anchors

- i. Are you from here? Do you have family in the area? do you see them?
- ii. Do you have a doctor/caseworker here?
- iii. Do you have someone you would call if you needed help?

b. Mobility and Location

- i. Tell me about your day yesterday? What did you do first after you woke up? Where did you go?
- ii. Do you ever go to the MSC? Or the Homeless highway?
- iii. Where do you go to hang out with friends?
- iv. Do you have a pet? Do you take it with you?

c. Pathways

- i. How did you end up there? How did you hear about it?
- ii. How do you get around? Do you have a bike?
- iii. Where were you last summer
- iv. Where were you last last year?
- v. Do you have an idea of how many encampments you have been in since last winter?
- vi. Where did you last stay?
- vii. Why did you move?
- viii. Did others move with you?
- ix. Will you move when the rains start?

d. Preferences

- i. Have you ever stayed at the shelter? When? What did you like/dislike about it?
- ii. What do you like about being outside?
- iii. What would make an ideal encampment?

2. Community Ethos

a. Sharing v. Keeping personal Property (Money and exchanges)

- i. How do you manage when you need money?
- ii. If you are in need of something, do other people in the camp help you out?
- iii. I heard about a guy who got a big check and bought supplies for everyone in his encampment? has this kind of thing happened at your encampment? have you ever experienced anything like that?

b. Hierarchy, Rules and transgressions

- i. What is the worst thing someone can do in the encampment?
- ii. Do you know anyone who had been kicked out of an encampment? Why?
- iii. What happens if you disagree with how someone is behaving?
- iv. Have you seen anyone get hurt in the encampments? What happened?

3. Environment

- a. Resources- Water use, natural materials, fish
 - i. Have you stayed at encampments that were not near water?
 - ii. How was that different?
 - iii. Is being near water a good thing? Why?
 - iv. Do you think the water is okay to drink?
 - v. How do other people in the encampment make use of the water?
- b. Risks-Water as danger (flood, etc)
 - i. Have you ever had your area flooded?
 - ii. Can you tell me what that was like?
- c. Officials and Garbage
 - i. Have you had any interaction with Caltrans?
 - ii. What about the police?
 - iii. How do you hear about abatements?
 - iv. One woman I was talking to was joking that Caltrans was like maid service because they come in and clean everything up, do you see camps that get too dirty?
 - v. What do you do when this happens?
 - vi. What do you think is the biggest source of garbage in the encampments?

Anything you want to add?

Appendix B: Agency Survey Questions

1. Can you tell me about how and when you get involved with homeless encampments?
2. Does your agency have any specific protocols in place? If so, how were they developed? What is your assessment of how well they work?
3. Do you collaborate with other agencies on this issue? Why and how often?
4. Have you noticed any shifts or new trends in the issues you are dealing with?
5. Has your agency response been influenced by changes in legal requirements or state/national policy?
6. What do you see as the biggest constraints in dealing with this issue?
7. What do you see as the best possible outcome?
8. Have you heard about any programs in other areas?

CITY OF VALLEJO

ADMINISTRATIVE RULE

**SUBJECT: GARBAGE REMOVAL;
CLEAN UP OF TEMPORARY
SHELTERS AND CODE
ENFORCEMENT
ABATEMENT
PROCEDURES**

A. R. Number: 7.10
Date Effective: 09-28-11
Date Revised: [00-00-00]

I. PURPOSE

The City of Vallejo receives regular complaints from citizens and businesses throughout the City which relate to health and safety, criminal activity and other concerns arising in and around areas in which individuals have erected temporary shelters.

By this Administrative Rule, the City of Vallejo sets forth its policies and procedures for cleaning up areas in which individuals have constructed temporary shelters, and expresses its intention to implement these policies in a manner which balances the needs and rights of all of its citizens, including the residents of such temporary shelters. This policy does not establish any individual right to erect temporary shelters or otherwise encroach on public or private property.

II. POLICY

The City of Vallejo shall respond to complaints and concerns arising in and around areas in which individuals have erected temporary shelters, in a manner that protects the public health and safety and which complies with applicable state, federal and local laws.

III. PROCEDURE

Procedures applicable to the abatement of all trash, garbage, junk and debris, enforcement of trespass laws and the abatement of encampments are set forth in Sections III, IV and V. Procedures applicable to code enforcement activities are set forth in Section VI.

A. Garbage Removal on City-Owned Property

1. The City of Vallejo Public Works Maintenance Division (PWMD) regularly receives requests to remove trash or debris which have accumulated on or around City-owned property. The PWMD shall continue to receive and act upon these requests for service consistent with its historical practice. However, absent exigent circumstances, when the PWMD determines that a request for service involves the removal of trash or debris located within 200 feet of an area which contains temporary shelters, said removal shall not take place without a minimum of three (3) days advanced written notice which shall be posted and served in a form substantially similar to Exhibit A, attached hereto.
2. The posting and/or service of said notice shall be performed in a manner which is reasonably calculated to provide effective notice to any residents of the adjacent temporary shelters. Where possible, the notice shall describe the area subject to garbage removal as clearly as possible (e.g., the East side of the 400 block of Olive Avenue).
3. As part of the removal of any trash or debris, the City of Vallejo shall not destroy any materials of apparent value which appear to be the personal property of any individual. Personal property of apparent value may include clothing, shoes, jackets, tents, sleeping bags, bed rolls, blankets, backpacks, duffel bags, bicycles, tools, watches, jewelry, audio and video equipment, medications, toiletries, eyeglasses, purses, handbags, personal papers, equipment, photographs, books and baby strollers.
4. Trash or debris includes property that appears to have been discarded by its owner, but the fact that property is unattended does not necessarily mean that it has been discarded. Reasonable doubt about whether property is "trash or debris" or valuable property should be resolved in favor of the conclusion that the property is valuable and has not been discarded.

B. Private Property, Including Public Property Not Owned by the City.

The City will not respond to requests by private property owners, or owners of public property not owned by the City, to remove junk, trash or debris accumulated on private property or public property not owned by the City, unless a clean-up effort has been approved, in advance, by the City Manager or his or her designee. In instances in which such approval is granted, and the request for services involves the removal of trash or debris occurring within 200 feet of an area which contains temporary shelters, the City will follow the notice procedure set forth in Section III. A, above.

IV. CLEAN UP(s)

A. Private Property, Including Public Property Not Owned by the City.

The City of Vallejo regularly receives complaints and information from residents and business owners regarding the existence of temporary encampments constructed by individuals on private property that have no legal right or permission to occupy the property. These complaints include a broad range of issues, including, but not limited to; blight, the accumulation of trash and garbage, loitering, trespass, prostitution, drug sales and use, trespass and other crimes.

1. In situations where the City has received complaints or information regarding alleged criminal activity at temporary encampments established on public or private property, the Police Department will be contacted to respond to handle the situation in accordance with current policy.
2. The City will not respond to a request by private property owners to remove junk, trash or debris left behind on private property, including public property not owned by the City unless a clean-up effort has been approved in advance by the City Manager or his or her designee, and an abatement warrant has been approved by a Court of a competent jurisdiction. In instances in which such approval is granted, the removal of trash and debris on private property shall be performed as set forth in Section V. below.

B. City-Owned Property

1. In situations where the City has received complaints or information regarding alleged criminal activity at temporary encampments established on City-owned property, the Police Department will respond to and handle the situation in accordance with current policy.
2. If a clean-up involves the collection of personal property of value, then the procedures set forth in Section V. below will be followed. If the City desires to remove garbage in conjunction with any such action, it shall follow the procedures in Section III above.

V. CLEAN-UP OF ENCAMPMENTS

For encampments of ten (10) or more individuals which have been in place for more than ten (10) days, the City shall seek to provide the residents of such encampments at least seven (7) days advance notice of the need to vacate said property by posting and serving written notice in a form substantially similar to the Notice attached hereto as Exhibit B.

A. Clean-up of Encampments on City-Owned Property.

1. In situations in which the City intends to abate encampments that are located on City-owned property, the City will provide written notice of the intended abatement in a form substantially similar to the Notice attached as Exhibit C. The City will collect and dispose of any junk, garbage and/or debris in the area and to the extent possible, will also collect and store any unattended personal property of value (as described in Section III above). Personal property collected by the City shall be stored for ninety (90) days without charge, during which time said property shall be available to be reclaimed by the subject owner. After the expiration of ninety (90) days, any unclaimed property will be destroyed.
2. The posting and service of said notice shall be performed in a manner which is reasonably calculated to provide effective notice to the residents of the temporary shelters, and to the extent possible, the notice shall describe the area subject to the abatement effort as clearly as possible. The notice shall also be served by hand delivery, mail, email, and/or facsimile on the organizations that assist residents of encampments including, but not limited to: CAP Solano, The Christian Help Center and Mission Solano.

B. Clean-up of Encampments on Private Property, Including Public Property Not Owned by the City.

Requests by property owners to enforce trespass laws may be reported to the Police Department or the City Manager's Office. The Police Department will respond to and handle the situation in accordance with current policy. However, the City will not respond to a request by a private property owner to clean-up encampments located on private property, or on public property not owned by the City unless the clean-up request has been approved, in advance, by the City Manager's Office and an abatement warrant has been approved by a Court of a competent jurisdiction. In instances in which such approval is granted, cleanup of encampments on private property shall be performed as set forth in Section V.A.

VI. CODE ENFORCEMENT

- A.** It is anticipated that the City of Vallejo will from time to time, pursue code enforcement activities concerning the abatement of a public nuisance which includes temporary encampments constructed by individuals. These activities may include, but are not limited to, weed abatement, the collection and/or disposal of junk, garbage or debris, as well as the collection or disposal of personal property in and around the area of encampments.
- B.** In situations where code enforcement activities to abate a public nuisance involve the collection of personal property of value (as described in Section II.A.3 above) which reasonably appears to belong to an individual, the City will provide at least a three (3) to seven (7) day written notice of the intended clean-up in a form substantially similar to the Notice attached as Exhibit D, and which shall describe the areas subject to the code enforcement activities as clearly as possible.
- C.** At the time the City abates the subject nuisance; it will collect and dispose of any junk, garbage or debris in the area and will also collect and store unattended personal property which reasonably appears to belong to an individual. Personal property collected by City as part of an abatement effort shall be stored for ninety (90) days without charge, during which time it shall be available to be reclaimed by the subject owner. After the expiration of ninety (90) days any unclaimed property will be destroyed.

Appendix D: Camp Cycles

This table profiles some of the ways in which camps would get established over time and how people would move in and out of camps.

Typology	Old-Timer Camp A	Old-Timer Camp B	Veteran Camp	New-Comer Camp
Capacity & Location	8-20 residents spread along waterway, near light industry	2-4 residents, under bridge in business district	0-1 resident	Started with one person, over period of three months grew to between 12-20
Visibility	Camouflaged from the road, with leaves and branches hiding tents	Completely hidden under a bridge, residents used a rope to navigate down to the camp and the area was only accessible from business parking lot where a fence obscured it from view.	On the side of a riverbank and could only be accessed through a hole in a fence. The outer perimeter was a fence covered with ivy that separated the area from a main road.	Under highway overpass not immediately until it grew and property and garbage could be seen from side of the road
Structure	Run by one person, whose permission was need to camp. Rules included: no noise or parties, no strangers and low profile during business hours Rooting was cause for immediate expulsion	Two main residents had lived here since 2006. I was told this had once been a large camp full of garbage and that when it was cleared, these two residents had moved to the other side and kept low profile.	The first three times I visited this site it was unoccupied although you could tell it had once hosted a well organized camp.	Unclear structure, by end of three months, none of original inhabitants still resided here
Stability	Stable population over 8 months	Stable since 2006	Hope team told me it had hosted 20 people before it was cleaned out. The last visited it was occupied by one person who had been told about the area by another homeless.	Eventually cleared, remained unoccupied for three weeks and then resettled. Was cleared again and is currently unoccupied

Appendix D: Policy Recommendations

Policy	Target Population	Agency to Implement	Season for Implementation	Target Landscape	Complementary Policy Required
Garbage program	New-Comers	CCFCD With outreach	Spring Summer Fall	Good camps	Outreach
Policing	New-Comers	CCFCD	Summer	Bad camps	Abatements and Outreach
Abatements	New Comers Old Timers	CCFCD with adjacent agencies	Fall/Winter	Bad Camps	Interagency collaboration And Shelter Provision
Housing Vouchers	Old timers	CCFCD with outreach	All	N/A	Public Health/Police/Outreach
Housing Provision	All	City and County government with State/Federal Support			
Landscaping to decrease cover and increase use	New Comers	CCFCD	Spring/Summer	Most effective where county has large jurisdiction	Fence Removal Policing
Landscaping to mitigate pollution	All				
Pet Shelter	New Comers	Public Health	All	Camps with Pets	Outreach
Fence Removal	New Comers Old Timers	CALTRANS	Summer	Good Camps	Interagency collaboration And Landscape design
Sanctioned Tent City	Old timers	City governments and Public Health	All	N/A	Public Health/Police/Outreach
Restroom Installations	Everyone		All	Targeted central camps near trails	Public works

FINAL DRAFT (October 18, 2010)

Citizen Review Panel Recommendations on

Encampments and Seattle's Unsheltered Homeless Population

The Citizen Review Panel on Housing and Services for Seattle's Unsheltered Homeless Population recommends the City of Seattle sanction and offer available property to a self-governed encampment to help meet the immediate survival and safety needs of individuals in our community who have no access to safe shelter.

While the Citizen Panel endorses the establishment of an encampment, panel members also strongly urge the City of Seattle to continue to aggressively develop permanent, affordable housing options for individuals and families transitioning out of homelessness. Encampments, along with other forms of substandard housing, should not become a substitute for safe, affordable permanent housing.

Background

The 2010 One-Night Count of people without shelter found 1,986 people outside in Seattle. The community's shelter system simply does not have the capacity to shelter all these in need. Currently Seattle is home to SHARE/WHEEL's Tent City 3, which operates under a Consent Decree with the City, and is also home to Nickelsville, a more informal operation run by Veterans for Peace, a 501 (c) 3 organization.

At a time when there are many unsheltered individuals on the streets, encampments can provide a viable housing option. An encampment can provide privacy, community and the freedom to come and go for very low-income individuals at a low cost. The appeal of encampment traditions in Seattle is that they provide 24-hour access, can accommodate couples and pets, and offer other benefits of self-governance. Well-managed encampments here and across the country have demonstrated they can provide community, safety and dignity in people's lives.

While encampments may be a low-cost, stop-gap alternative to more permanent housing options, moving any type of shelter every three months makes focusing on acquiring permanent housing more difficult. Encampment situations, legal arrangements and land use issues have to date required Tent Cities to move at least every 90 days. Seattle has a number of potential sites for a semi-permanent encampment, but establishing access may be difficult. Finding a suitable site for a long-term encampment may be challenging but it should lead to better outcomes for its residents.

Considerations

Location and facilities:

The location for an encampment should provide reasonable access to key services such as transportation. A measure of this is proximity to a bus stop. Nickelsville residents have told us they don't mind a semi-industrial area, as long as the neighbors are

“friendly.” Members of the Mayor’s committee worry, however, about the message of “marginalization” signaled by an isolated location.

An encampment should have access to adequate hygiene facilities, ensure for the timely removal of trash, and provide appropriate facilities for food preparation. We strongly recommend the site have access to electricity and running water. Access to a sewage hook up would reduce ongoing costs for removing waste.

In addition, the Review Panel recommends the City of Seattle allow alternatives to tents for residents. In particular, semi-permanent built structures that offer shelter from wind and rain would increase privacy and comfort.

The location of an encampment should also take into consideration the possible impact to the surrounding community. The City of Seattle should ensure that neighbors are provided appropriate notice of and have an opportunity to comment.

Cost:

Encampments have proven to be short-term alternatives to more costly permanent housing options. There are both fixed and variable costs. Nickelsville reports its variable costs to shelter 100 people are about \$3000 per month, including honey buckets, sink, garbage removal, cell phones, printing, food for meetings, and occasional moves. This does not include bus tickets, estimated at \$1200 per month, nor does it include salary costs for staff (regular leadership and communication people.) Tent City 3 reports costs of \$6,000 per month, which includes bus tickets and salary costs for staff.

While encampments are generally low-cost, the Review Panel strongly urges the City of Seattle to weigh these costs against other potential investments that may have equal or greater positive impact in the lives of individuals experiencing homelessness. A 2005 City Council study suggests that encampments cost less than the cost of a professionally managed shelter. However, encampments should not be considered an alternative for professionally managed shelters that serve individuals who are not able to succeed in a self-managed environment.

Organizations operating encampments must set budgets that are sustainable and that emphasize new funding resources. Encampments cannot expect operating expenses to come from the City of Seattle. Encampments are expected to raise some portion of their own expenses. The City and County should consider contributing the public services they are in the business of providing, such as bus tickets and utilities.

Various alternatives to the low-cost, self-managed model were considered. These alternatives were rejected due to increased costs of implementation. These additional costs might make encampments more costly than more permanent solutions.

Size:

It is recommended that the initial size of an encampment not exceed 100 – 150 individuals. The Panel recognizes that a single encampment will not meet the need of all unsheltered people. The population for whom a self-managed encampment is appropriate may, however, be limited.

A larger encampment may be divided into 2 or 3 “neighborhoods,” where most of the day-to-day self management of the community would occur. If Seattle continues to have large numbers of unsheltered individuals with no other recourse to shelter, and if no other cost effective solutions have become available, consideration should be given to either increasing the size or number of semi-permanent encampments.

It is recommended that consideration of increasing the number or size of encampments only be considered once agreed upon benchmarks are met. These benchmarks could include encampment governance, maintenance of encampment site and encampment structures, funding capacity, and accessibility of services.

If benchmarks are met, the City of Seattle should consider increasing capacity at that site (if physically possible) or another encampment begun.

Management:

The current self-management of encampments provides a number of benefits including resident empowerment and low cost. These reasons suggest a continuation of facilitated self-management is desirable.

A renewable lease agreement negotiated with the sponsoring non-profit is recommended. Renewal would be conditioned on the meeting of City-defined expectations in a written agreement. If renewal is not offered, the Encampment would have to close or go find private property on which to continue its operations, such as a church. It would be expected that the encampment operator fully honor all contract provisions, including those addressing the end of the encampments tenancy.

The Review Panel recommends that the City of Seattle work with the present encampment manager of Nickelsville (Veterans for Peace - Chapter 92) to establish a semi-permanent encampment. The city of Seattle should also consider contracting the Veterans for Peace for the on-going management of a semi-permanent encampment.

Please note that at the present time the Review Panel cannot recommend contracting directly with SHARE/WHEEL. The City of Seattle's consent agreement with SHARE/WHEEL would make it difficult for SHARE/WHEEL to manage an encampment under the conditions set forth in this recommendation. However, once the consent agreement expires it may be advisable for the City of Seattle to work with both Veterans for Peace and SHARE/WHEEL to create the strongest possible management system for an encampment.

Regardless of the management arrangement the encampment should work with the City of Seattle to ensure that all pertinent insurance coverage is up-to-date and provides appropriate coverage to encampment residents.

Rules

The rules for a sanctioned encampment need to be similar to those currently upheld by the self-governed Nickelsville encampment, including no drugs, no weapons, required ID, and no housing for sex offenders. Encampment governance can establish rules on pets, children, medications, and duties.

We recommend the self-governed structure include a process to conduct impartial hearings for rule violations, and for an appeals process.

Support Services:

The Review Panel strongly recommends that encampment managers provide residents access to information on how to access support services for finding jobs, housing, health care and the like. The Review Panel recommends that the encampment provide facilities suitable for other service providers to use on-site. Further, contracting with agencies providing outreach and engagement services may be useful as a way to link encampment residents to critical support services.

Data Reporting Requirements:

We recognize the need to monitor our progress towards the goal of eliminating homelessness. It is reasonable to expect the entity selected to provide management and oversight to an encampment to comply with any data reporting requirements mandated by the City of Seattle or any other public or private funder.

Alternatives to Encampments:

Encampments provide a viable, low-cost alternative to individuals who are unsheltered. However, there are other possible alternatives the City of Seattle may want to consider in addition to encampments. With some additional funding it may be possible to expand the availability of faith-based shelters, although we acknowledge those may not meet the needs of all people. The City should also consider opening public spaces (e.g. City Hall) for the use of individuals seeking shelter.

Evaluation:

The City of Seattle shall conduct regular evaluations of encampment management.

Final note

While the Review Panel does recommend the creation of a City of Seattle sanctioned semi-permanent encampment, it does so knowing that an encampment should never be considered a long-term solution to homelessness. The Review Panel urges the City of Seattle to continue to pursue real, lasting and permanent solutions to homelessness. The Review Panel recognizes that providing unsheltered individuals access to a safe alternative is humane and important. The Review Panel also recognizes that once established, an encampment is likely not to close until the level of shelter and housing in this community is sufficient to meet the demand.

